

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 28, 2009, has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 1, 7, 17, 20-22, 25-31, 34, 35, 37 and 41. Entry of the amendments to claims 1, 7, 17, 20-22, 25-31, 34, 35, 37 and 41 is respectfully requested. Reconsideration of the outstanding objections/rejections in the present application is also respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

I. **THE NON-STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 6, 7, 17, 20, 21-26, 27-31, 33-38 AND 40-41**

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 17, 20, 21-26, 27-31, 33-38 and 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

“A claimed process is patent-eligible under § 101 if: (1) it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing.” In re Bilski, 545 F.3d 943, 954 (Fed. Cir. 2008). That is, “a claimed process involving a fundamental principle that uses a particular machine or apparatus would not pre-empt uses of the principle that do not also use the specified machine or apparatus in the manner claimed.” Id. Also, “a claimed process that transforms a particular article to a specified different state or thing by applying a fundamental principle would not pre-empt the use of the principle to transform any other article, to transform the same article but in a manner not covered by the claim, or to do anything other than transform the specified article.” Id. Thus, “a claim that is tied to a particular machine or brings about a particular transformation of a particular article does not pre-empt all uses of a fundamental principle in any field but rather is limited to a particular use, a specific application.” Id. at 957. However, even if a claim recites a specific machine or a particular

transformation of a specific article, the recited machine or transformation must not constitute mere “insignificant postsolution activity.” Id.

The Examiner asserts that claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 17, 20, 21-26, 27-31, 33-38 and 40-41 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, in order to forward the present application toward allowance, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 (and some dependent claims) to more clearly recite a process that: (1) is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transforms a particular article into a different state or thing.

Claims 3, 6, 7, 17, 20, 21-26, 27-31, 33-38 and 40-41 are dependent upon independent claim 1 and thus inherently incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1, respectively. Thus, claims 3, 6, 7, 17, 20, 21-26, 27-31, 33-38 and 40-41 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the aforementioned non-statutory subject matter rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 17, 20, 21-26, 27-31, 33-38 and 40-41 be withdrawn.

II. THE INDEFINITENESS REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 5, 17, 20-22, 25-29, 31, 34, 36-37 AND 41

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 17, 20-22, 25-29, 31, 34, 36-37 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Although Applicant does not agree with the pending rejection, Applicant has nonetheless amended independent claim 1 to clarify to claimed subject matter. For example, with respect to the Examiner’s contention that the term “standard terms and conditions” is vague and indefinite, Applicant has deleted the term “standard” and clarified the claimed scope by stating that the

“terms and conditions” are “approved for transactions involving the buyer and seller.” With respect to the Examiner’s assertion that the term “initiation document” is vague and indefinite with respect to the “fields within the document,” Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the “initiation document” comprises a “purchase order or an application for a letter of credit.” Applicant has also amended independent claim 1 to clarify that “mapping” occurs in order to “enable tracking and monitoring of the status of the trade operation.” Lastly, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify that verification occurs by “comparing the at least one trade document to the customer profile using the computer processor.”

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned objection to claims 1, 5, 17, 20-22, 25-29, 31, 34, 36-37 and 41 be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams LLP

By: 

Ozzie A. Farres

Registration No. 43,606

Date: July 28, 2009
Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
Telephone: (202) 955-1500
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201